



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace

Vol. 82

NOVEMBER, 1920

No. 11

ADVOCATE OF PEACE

Edited by ARTHUR DERRIN CALL

Assist. Editor, GEO. P. MORRIS

Published since 1834 by

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

(1815-1828)

Suite 612-614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.

(Cable Address, "Ampax, Washington")

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, EXCEPT SEPTEMBER

Sent free to all members of the American Peace Society. Separate Subscription Price, \$1.50 a year. Single copies, twenty cents each.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, June 1, 1911, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under the act of July 16, 1894. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized August 10, 1918.

It being impracticable to express in these columns the divergent views of the thousands of members of the American Peace Society, full responsibility for the utterances of this magazine is assumed by the Editor.

NOTICE

THE OUTSIDE of the back cover of this magazine is of interest to every friend of the American Peace Society. It is important reading.

There are two notices there. Both need to be read. Both.

A friend said to us the other day, "Don't you find it humiliating to be obliged to seek out support for your work?" Our reply was, "The humiliation is limited to the fact that we are 'obliged' to seek support. The humiliation goes no further."

After such a history of unquestioned service running through practically a century, a history closely associated with most of the great men of our country since 1815, the American Peace Society should be self-supporting. It is not self-supporting.

But the American Peace Society is never without friends. For that reason it lives. It will continue to live, and for the same reason.

The task of breaking the silence of years just now, and of calling publicly for funds, is made easier, immeasurably easier, by the most encouraging offer of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

But the notices on our back cover are self-explanatory.

Another friend said an interesting thing recently. He said: "Strange how readily every one gives to the

splendid Red Cross, designed primarily to heal the wounds of war, and how comparatively few give to the American Peace Society, designed to make those very wounds unnecessary."

Verily, the work of the American Peace Society has only just begun.

THE CONSTRUCTIVE COURSE

A GOVERNED WORLD. It is not enough to repudiate error. The American Peace Society is more than an agency of opposition; its principles are affirmative. Once again we call the attention of our readers to the inside of the front cover of this magazine. So far as men can prevision the future in the present, the inevitable course of events through the days now before us is there clearly set forth.

THE ELEMENTS OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY ARE PERMANENT

THE GIFT OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE HEALING OF THE WORLD IS THE UNITED STATES

MR. HARDING interprets the vote of November 2 to mean that Mr. Wilson's League of Nations is "deceased." We believe that happily to be the case. This does not mean, of course, that the people of the United States have lost all interest in matters of foreign policy. Quite the contrary. The Paris League to Enforce Peace has gone the way of all other leagues to enforce peace hitherto; but there remain enduring substructures of a hopeful Society of Nations. They are illustrated by the principles peculiar to American foreign policy. These great principles to which this nation holds are as vivid, pertinent, and permanent today as ever. They are more so. These elements of our foreign policy are of more concern to every one of us now because of the war and because of the discussions through which we have passed. We are now better acquainted with foreign nations, and thus we are better acquainted with our own nation. And we admire it the more. The Homeric experiences of the last six years have revealed at least to every thinking American these classic elements of permanence in the foreign policy of the United States. The supreme duty of every one of us now is to turn his attention increasingly to these elements of permanence, for the supreme contribution which the United States is about to make to world

affairs is the United States itself. This is true because in the long processes by which disputes between States of the American Union have been settled in accord with the principles of law and justice we have exercised rules peculiarly germane to the foreign policy of States everywhere. Since this is true, we do well to remind ourselves of these elements of permanence in the settlement of disputes between States of the American Union, for thus, and thus only, can we appreciate the enduring things at the heart of American foreign policy, and play our honest part toward the establishment of a better world order. They constitute not only America's contribution to the world, they are the bases of that permanent foreign policy essential to any international peace. We are thinking of four of these elements of permanence.

The Universal Aspiration

The first element of permanence at the basis of our foreign policy is that United States' foreign policy is based upon, indeed, is an outgrowth of, a universal aspiration. That universal aspiration is that we may live more fully—that is to say, more healthfully, more happily, and therefore more justly. Because of this universal aspiration there is and always has been in America a prevailing desire to end war. Because war as a means of settling international disputes has such small relation to justice, since wars may be won and at the same time justice be defeated, we in America have generally condemned war. American citizenry is largely the offspring of this opposition among an ancestry that came to America to escape war. It may be said that war has been condemned by every great American. When Washington wrote, in 1785, "My first wish is to see this plague to mankind banished from the earth" he was voicing the aspiration of the ages. The will to end war is as old as history. Isaiah, Virgil, Dante, Erasmus, voiced this yearning of peoples in the long ago. By concentration of authority and force of arms the Roman Empire aimed at peace for its member States; and far away China, by a cultivation of the spirit within, aimed, and more successfully than did the Roman Empire, at the same goal. Opposition to war is as old as history.

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries various leagues to enforce peace were proposed, albeit with decreasing emphasis upon force. In 1623 Crucé published his *New Cyneas*, a plan for a league to enforce peace. Two years later Grotius, in his *De Jure Belli Ac Pacis*, also favored a league to enforce peace. Sully's plan, which he attributed to his sovereign, Henry IV, published in 1638, partook so much of the nature of a league to enforce peace that it essayed to maintain by force a status created by force, particularly in Austria. So surcharged with the idea of a league to enforce peace

were all these plans that the gentle William Penn incorporated in his "*Present and Future Peace of Europe*," 1693, the same principle of a league to enforce peace. Abbé Saint-Pierre's "*Perpetual Peace*" outlined a league to enforce peace which a century later became the actual basis of that unhappy league to enforce peace known as the "Holy Alliance." Beginning, however, with the writings of Rousseau, and extending through the work of other men, the plans for international peace savored less and less of force. In Jeremy Bentham's "*Plan for a Universal and Perpetual Peace*," written between 1786 and 1789, but not published until 1839, force is difficult to find, while Immanuel Kant wrote in 1795 his "*Perpetual Peace*," proposing a representative league for the realization of public law, with all reference to force eliminated entirely. Thus through two centuries, with a gradual elimination of force as a means of establishing peace, there was a growing and increasing intelligence in the attempt to overcome war.

The efforts to end war increased most markedly through the nineteenth century. The nineteenth century absorbed and improved upon the peace aspirations of the two preceding centuries. The Constitutional Convention of 1787 set itself to the task of establishing a permanent peace between thirteen free, sovereign and independent States. This is a very significant fact. We know now that that was the most successful peace conference of history. The writings of the great men of that period, and some of them were very great men, repeatedly expressed the aspirations of men everywhere that wars might be prevented. Franklin, Washington, Jefferson, Madison, were repeatedly outspoken in the matter. The Monroe Doctrine of 1823 was first enunciated in the interest of "peace and safety." What we now know as the "peace movement" began in the early years of the nineteenth century. The American Peace Society was the most pronounced expression of the nineteenth century expressions of the growing opposition to war, because of it many international congresses being held in the attempt to do away with war. The Pan-American movement, expressing itself variously in international conferences, became articulate and effective upon the initiative of James G. Blaine during the '80's of the nineteenth century. The century witnessed the creation of numberless international organizations, of which the Universal Postal Union, perfected in 1906, was but one. The Hague Conferences, destined to be appreciated more and more, were the culminating expression of the nineteenth century will to end war. This opposition to war has been at the very heart of American foreign policy, whether that policy related to issues between free, sovereign and independent American States or between the United States and foreign powers. Thus

America's foreign policy is based upon a universal aspiration, and for that reason it is based upon permanence.

The Practical Basis

A second element of permanence in American foreign policy is the fact that it is the outgrowth not of idealism merely, but of concrete experiences as well. In its beginnings, for example, we find it related to definite international problems growing out of international situations covering centuries prior to 1787. The inter-colonial controversies of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries revealed concrete international situations calling for international adjustments. Thus the Constitutional Convention of 1787 was made up of men with a background of a long history of actual international situations. When they went about the business, therefore, of handling the public debt incurred "in the sacred cause," of overcoming the inefficiencies due to the weaknesses in the Articles of Confederation, they brought to the solution of those difficulties an international wisdom. When they grappled with the problems of the tariff and found that Connecticut was taxing imports from Massachusetts higher than she taxed the same kind of goods from Great Britain, they met all such situations with "an international mind" and in an international manner. Their problems were international. Different States were making separate treaties with the Indians, a number of them violating contracts. The new country was without credit. It met with little from abroad except disdain. Such were a few of the other concrete international situations calling for international adjustments. Mr. Washington called the Conference at Alexandria in 1785 because of definite questions relating to commerce and boundaries between the States of Virginia and Maryland. As a result of that Conference the difficulties affecting other States became clearer. Hence there followed the next year another and larger conference at Annapolis. At that conference the practical problems facing the States made it clear that a still more general conference was imperative. Thus out of concrete experiences, many of them international in substance, some of them covering many years, arose the Constitutional Convention of 1787, an international conference.

Every school boy knows that the success of that meeting in Philadelphia was due to three things, namely, intelligence, compromise, and good will. Faced with the problem of setting up a more perfect union, of preserving the spirit and power of the union of the States and of providing for the interdependence of each, those international things were achieved by that intelligence, compromise, and good will everywhere characteristic of any permanent foreign policy.

Being a conference of States, free, sovereign, and independent, the American Conference of 1787 was thus an international conference, but, more, it was adequate to its purpose. All difficulties due to the fact that some of the States were large and some small were satisfactorily adjusted. Adequate provision was made for the settlement of both justiciable and non-justiciable questions. While provisions were made for the maintenance of law, even to the point of coercion of individuals, no provisions were made for the coercion of States. It was perfectly clear to the statesmen of that day, as it must be made perfectly clear to the statesmen of this day, that any league to enforce peace is a contradiction in terms; that there is but one way to coerce a State and that is by war. Our fathers saw that clearly and expressed themselves upon the matter unequivocally.

So, because of these two reasons, that American foreign policy is an outgrowth of a universal opposition to war; and that American foreign policy is based upon the substructures of long concrete experiences prior to 1787, a concrete intelligence, compromise, and good will leading to a concrete program and conference in 1787, a conference, faced with concrete international situations, quite the same in principle as the international situation that is facing the world today, a conference where these international problems were effectively and adequately solved. American foreign policy, profiting by that experience, is a policy of permanence.

The Balance Between Rights and Duties

There is a third reason why American foreign policy is possessed of the elements of permanence. The principles of American foreign policy represent a balance between rights and duties. It is not necessary here to call upon the history of our law and politics to prove this. The United States of America is itself an illustration of the fact that States have a right to exist; and since they have this right, they have the correlative duty to commit no unlawful act against innocent or unoffending States. This our more perfect union is a constant illustration of the principle that States have the right to their independence and happiness, and that, therefore, they have the duty to interfere with neither the independence nor the happiness of other States. We of this country recognize that States have the right to equality before the law, and that, therefore, it is the duty of States to respect this right in other States. We maintain that States have the right to their territory and to jurisdiction over that territory, and that States have the duty to violate neither the territory nor the jurisdiction over that territory in the case of other States. It is our accepted policy that States have the right to respect and to protection in their rights, and that, therefore, States have the duty to respect and to protect

others in such rights. Finally, we insist that States have the right in case of controversy to a hearing under the law, and that, therefore, it is the duty of all States to uphold the law. Thus the United States itself represents a balance between rights and duties, and we as a nation survive because that is the case.

All this is but another way of saying that we in America are a government of laws and not of men, and that successful government must rest on the free consent of the governed.

Some seem to forget these great elemental things at the heart of America. They forgot them in Paris. We shall not forget them. We shall remember them. We called the attention of the other nations of the earth to these elementary principles November 2. There they are. We do not have to defend them. They are the self-explanatory elements of permanence in our own foreign policy, but they are more. They are the only hopeful principles for the foreign policy of any State. They are the warp and the woof of any possible association of nations designed to overcome war.

The Hope of the World

Thus in no insignificant sense American foreign policy is the hope of the world. This is the fourth element of permanence in that policy. It has expressed itself variously in the doctrine of James Monroe, in the golden rule doctrine of John Hay, in the arbitration doctrine of John Bassett Moore, in the judicial settlement doctrine of Elihu Root and James Brown Scott, in the law and justice doctrine of the American Peace Society; but the policy is the same throughout. America sat with twenty-six nations in 1899, and the world accepted then in part these essences of American foreign policy. Once more, America sat with forty-four nations of the world in 1907, and the principles of American foreign policy advanced again. In so far as these principles were ignored by the conferees in Paris the establishment of a permanent foreign policy for the nations was by that much postponed. Idealism there was in Paris, but idealism is not enough. Fact and experience must be reckoned with. Force is not a guarantee of peace between States. Intelligence, compromise, and good will are the only sanctions of peace. A balance between rights and duties is the indispensable means to any effective association of nations. America has shown the way.

If we are to live, legislate, and demand a greater health and happiness, a more creative service for all in an advancing democracy; if we are to find those wider significances of what it means to live; if we are to do our share that the world may be more humane, more just, more free, we indeed must all apply our minds

unto this answer to the cry of the ages, this contribution peculiarly ours, assuredly enduring, supremely hopeful, our established foreign policy, the only possible basis of any permanent foreign policy.

A HISTORY OF INTERNATIONALISM

WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED the book, but Alfred H. Fried tells us in *Die Friedens-Warte* of September, 1920, that Christian L. Lange, secretary of the Interparliamentary Union and well-known Norwegian scholar, has just published the first volume of "*Histoire de l'Internationalisme*." The books are being published by H. Aschhög & Co., Christiania, and they are to take their place among the publications of the Nobel Institute. Dr. Fried says of the work: "Among all attempts to write a history of the peace idea, the work of Christian L. Lange is pre-eminent."

It seems that Dr. Lange started the work half a generation ago. This first volume, which we understand is a large text, covers only the history of the time of the Peace of Westphalia, 1648. The author's original plan was to write a history of the peace movement of the 19th century, but, finding a dearth of material in the literature leading up to this movement, he turned his attention to supplying this material. Hence originated the larger plan of writing a complete history of internationalism.

Dr. Fried says that it is not only a history of the peace movement, but a history of the steadily developing relation between nations and States. From Dr. Fried's account we gather that the author looks upon internationalism as the highest form of pacifism. He classifies pacifism into three kinds: first, emotional; second, utilitarian; third, moral and ethical. Above these three groups he places a fourth, which he calls internationalism. He grants that internationalists recognize that war is inevitable as long as human relations are not organized. Not that States must be done away with, but that they must be organized. He goes further and says that internationalism does not reject the use of force, but aims to place force at the service of right, within a society of nations. "Thus," adds Dr. Fried, "Lange creates a sociological constructive pacifism." This "constructive pacifism," with its four groups, has never been lacking in the development of our Western culture. To prove this, we are told, is the principal purpose of the work. We are told that the first chapters describe pacifistic tendencies during ancient history, thence to the ascendancy of the Pope. In the fourth chapter the author refers to the "precursor of modern internationalism." In this chapter is found the com-